REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are pending

The response made herein is permissible under 37 CFR 1.116, and no new search is required.

I. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 26-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

In claim 26 the USPTO rejects the language quoted below as new matter:

> "means for decrypting the converted received encrypted data to recover said information using threshold sampling to avoid overlap between adjacent data in the converted encrypted data."

Applicants respectfully point to page 16, last paragraph to page 17 (top) at equations 24 and 25 for support. It is explained therein that at the receiver end, **another sampling occurs** at the rate $x = n(\Delta)$ (note also p. 16 bottom: when ... the reconstructed data do not overlap) and modified reconstructed encrypted data are given by equation 24. Equation 24 is then multiplied by the phase key during the overall decryption process of equations 24-26. Thus, the USPTO is respectfully incorrect that this resampling to avoid overlap (threshold) during the decryption process (Equation 24 * phase key) is new matter as claimed in claim 26.

The same arguments apply to independent claims 29 and 31.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claims 1-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Javidi et al (5,903,648) in view of the article, Sun et al. ("All Optical Parallel-to-Serial Conversion by Holographic Spatial-to-Temporal Frequency Encoding") and the article by Marom et al. ("Analysis of Spatial-Temporal Converters for All-Optical Communication Links").

The USPTO notes at page 5 of the Office Action that Javidi and Sun do not disclose the claimed threshold sampling. Thus, the Marom article is newly cited in the final rejection

as disclosing threshold sampling to avoid overlap between adjacent data at the receiving end.

However, in Marom article there in no decryption system at all.

Therefore, Marom does not need to use any claimed threshold sampling or re-sampling (see present equations 24-26) at a decryption system of a receiving end because in Marom the data is already recovered. See above where we discuss that another sampling or re-sampling of the reconstructed encrypted spatial data occurs during decryption at least in the "decryption means" for example at equations 24-26 which is multiplied by the phase key in order to recover original data.

Instead, in Marom general data processing methods are disclosed like data sampling at the transmitter.

Thus, applicants do not agree that it would be obvious to view Marom and then to modify the Javidi encryption method to use threshold sampling to somehow improve or recover lost encrypted data of Javidi and also to be transmitted according to Sun. In fact, the inventors who are experts in the field, state that no one had threshold sampled encrypted data and decrypted it with a phase key so that lost data could be recovered as is claimed here before. Therefore, as the inventors are skilled experts in the art, and do not think this is an obvious combination, it respectfully asserted that this is not an obvious combination to one skilled in the art.

Also, it is respectfully noted that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been presented as required by 35 USC 103 and the case law (See MPEP 706.02(j)) at least because all of the limitations of the claims have not been taught or suggested by the combination of the three cited references. For example, the decryption method claimed is not disclosed.

Claim 31 is corrected because it was not indicated to be "currently amended" in the previous response.

III. Conclusion.

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that the claims herein should now be allowable to Applicants. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are requested.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Please telephone the undersigned for any reason. Applicants seek to cooperate with the Examiner and to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Daniel P. Lent
Registration No. 44,867

Date: July 6, 2006
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929, Ext. 1137
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No.: 23413